

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending.

Claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-27 over Huerga

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-16, 18, 20-23 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 5,960,085 to de la Huerga ("Huerga"), with claims 16, 17, 19, 24, 25 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Huerga. The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1-3 and 5-7 recite a system relying on an information exchange module to wirelessly communicate a security code with a database through a wireless front end upon a user entering an area requiring authorization and a receiver to receive a photograph for display on an electronic display from the database upon proper authorization of the security code and upon the user entering the area requiring authorization. Claims 9 and 11 recite a wireless front end adapted to transmit a user identification information of a wearer of an electronic wireless badge device retrieved from a database of user identification information to trigger an electronic display on the electronic wireless badge device to electronically display a photograph on the electronic wireless badge upon a user entering an area requiring authorization. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11 recite a system relying on a photograph for display on an electronic display upon proper authorization of a security code and upon a user entering an area requiring authorization.

Huerga appears to disclose a system using a personal identification badge to collect data and to provide access to a computer terminal (Abstract). A user attempting to log onto the computer terminal wearing the personal identification badge is interrogated to determine access privileges to the computer terminal (See Huerga, col. 11, line 46-col. 12, line 32). The personal identification badge comprises an electronic display to display a photograph (See Fig. 1).

Thus, Huerga's invention is directed toward a security badge that gives a wearer access privileges to a computer terminal. The security badge has

the ability to display a photograph on an electronic display. However, Huerga fails to disclose or suggest CONDITIONAL display of a photograph on an electronic display, i.e., upon proper authorization of a security code and upon a user entering an area requiring authorization, as recited by claims 1-3, 5-7, 9 and 11.

A benefit of conditional display of a photograph on an electronic display upon proper authorization of a security code and upon a user entering an area requiring authorization is, e.g., easier determination of if a user is authorized to be within an area requiring authorization. Conventional security badges require a person reviewing authorization to closely review the conventional security badge to determine if a wearer matches a photograph on the conventional security badge. However, conditional display of a photograph allows a user to simply glance at a security badge to determine authorization from if a photograph is present or not. The cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features having such benefits.

Claims 12-27 recite a system and method of establishing a wireless network between a network security station and a plurality of electronic wireless badges.

The Examiner only addresses limitations from claims 12-27 of “electronically displaying said badge display information on each of said plurality of electronic wireless badges” at col. 9, lines 45-50 (See Office Action, page 3). The Examiner FAILS to address ALL of the claim limitations from claims 12-27, i.e., the Examiner FAILS to address the claimed features of a system and method of establishing a wireless network between a network security station and a plurality of electronic wireless badges. Thus, the rejection of claims 12-27 is IMPROPER for FAILING to address ALL of the claimed features.

Moreover, Huerga discloses a network of personal computers and computer terminals (See Fig. 7). However, Huerga fails to disclose or suggest a system and method of establishing a wireless network between a network security station and a plurality of electronic wireless badges, as recited by claims 12-27.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-27 are

patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 10 over Huerga in view of Bork

In the Office Action, claims 4 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Huerga in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,246,376 Bork et al. (“Bork”). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 4 recites a system relying on an information exchange module to wirelessly communicate a security code with a database through a wireless front end upon a user entering an area requiring authorization and a receiver to receive a photograph for display on an electronic display from the database upon proper authorization of the security code and upon the user entering the area requiring authorization. Claim 10 recites a wireless front end adapted to transmit a user identification information of a wearer of an electronic wireless badge device retrieved from a database of user identification information to trigger an electronic display on the electronic wireless badge device to electronically display a photograph on the electronic wireless badge upon a user entering an area requiring authorization. Thus, claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11 recite a system relying on a photograph for display on an electronic display upon proper authorization of a security code and upon a user entering an area requiring authorization.

As discussed above, Huerga fails to disclose or suggest a system relying on a photograph for display on an electronic display upon proper authorization of a security code and upon a user entering an area requiring authorization, as recited by claims 4 and 10.

The Examiner relies on Bork to allegedly disclose a BLUETOOTH device relying on a BLUETOOTH protocol (See Office Action, page 5). However, Bork’s invention is directed toward transferring location information between two device (Abstract). Bork fails to disclose or suggest use of BLUETOOTH for anything related to security, much less disclose or suggest a system relying on a photograph for display on an electronic display upon proper authorization of a security code and upon a user entering an area requiring authorization, as

recited by claims 4 and 10.

Thus, even if it were obvious to modify Huerga with the disclosure of Bork (which it is not since Huerga user's location is already known, i.e., sitting in front of a terminal), the theoretical result would fail to disclose or suggest a system relying on a photograph for display on an electronic display upon proper authorization of a security code and upon a user entering an area requiring authorization, as recited by claims 4 and 10.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-3, 5-9 and 11-27 are patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



William H. Bollman
Reg. No. 36,457

Manelli Denison & Selter PLLC
2000 M Street, NW Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036-3307
TEL. (202) 261-1020
FAX. (202) 887-0336
WHB/df